

PERFORMANCE TRENDS OVER 4-YEAR PERIOD

	Absolute Rating	Improvement Rating	Adequate Yearly Progress
2001	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	N/A
2002	Average	Excellent	N/A
2003	Average	Below Average	No
2004	Good	Excellent	No

DEFINITIONS OF DISTRICT RATING TERMS

- Excellent District performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- •Good District performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Average District performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Below Average District is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal
- Unsatisfactory District performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 SC Performance Goal

HIGH SCHOOL ASSESSMENT PROGRAM (HSAP) EXAM PASSAGE RATE: SECOND YEAR STUDENTS

		Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours			
Percent	2004	2005	2006	2004	2005	2006
Passed 2 subtests	67.0	N/A	N/A	73.0	N/A	N/A
Passed 1 subtest	14.8	N/A	N/A	14.3	N/A	N/A
Passed no subtests	18.2	N/A	N/A	13.0	N/A	N/A

EXIT EXAM PASSAGE RATE BY SPRING 2004

	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Percent	95.4%	93.9%

ELIGIBILITY FOR LIFE SCHOLARSHIP

Percent of	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours
Seniors eligible for LIFE Scholarships at four-year institutions*	10.3	12.2
Seniors who met the SAT/ACT requirement	10.3	12.3
Seniors who met the grade point average	46.9	47.8

^{*}Using only the SAT/ACT and grade point average requirements

GRADUATION RATE

	Our School	High Schools with Students Like Ours		
Number of Students	410	198		
Number of Diplomas	283	145		
Rate	69.0%	73.6%		

PERFORMANCE BY STUDENT GROUPS								
	Exit Exam Passage Rate by Spring 2004		Eligibility for LIFE Scholarship		Graduation Rate			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	Met State Objective	
All Students	259	95.4	350	10.3	410	69.0	YES	
Gender								
Male	120	94.2	174	10.3	209	64.1	N/A	
Female	139	96.4	176	10.2	201	74.1	N/A	
Racial/Ethnic Group								
White	155	98.1	183	17.5	221	75.1	N/A	
African-American	101	91.1	162	1.9	181	63.0		
Asian/Pacific Islander	1	I/S	1	I/S	1	I/S	N/A	
Hispanic	2	I/S	4	I/S	6	33.3	N/A	
American Indian/Alaskan	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	I/S	N/A	
Racial/Ethnic Group								
Non disabled	252	96.0	311	11.6	361	76.2	N/A	
Disabilities other than speech	7	71.4	39	0.0	49	16.3	N/A	
Migrant Status								
Migrant	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	
Non-migrant	257	95.3	350	10.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	
English Proficiency								
Limited English Proficient	0	N/A	1	I/S	4	I/S	N/A	
Non-Limited English Proficient	257	95.3	349	10.3	404	69.6	N/A	
Socio-Economic Status								
Subsidized meals	82	87.8	141	2.1	172	51.7	N/A	
Full-pay meals	175	98.9	209	15.8	238	81.5	N/A	

HSAP PERFORMANCE									-
	Enrollment 1st	۰ / ۾	% Below Basis	} /	% Proficient	% Advanced	% Proficient and Advanced	Performance Objective	Particinati
	Jen J	resting % Tested	' / 👸	% Basic) j) j	[] jej	ة / قِوْزِ 1 قُوْزِ	Ž / Ž
	[]	- %	/ 🖗	/ %	1 %	1 \$	jg ig		[]
	्रिके	/ ~	/ %	/	/ %	/ %	184	/ ª ð	/ 👸
Frair	sh/Langua				/	1			
All Students	501 501	91.8	22.9	33.3	29.4	- 33.3% 14.4	52.1	YES	N
Gender		0 1.0	22.0	00.0	2011		02.1	. 20	
Male	232	89.7	28.0	36.2	25.1	10.6	43.0	N/A	N.
- emale	269	93.7	18.7	31.0	32.9	17.5	59.5	N/A	N
Racial/Ethnic Group									
White	250	94.0	11.5	28.2	35.9	24.4	66.7	YES	N
African-American	244	89.8	34.7	39.7	21.5	4.1	36.1	YES	N
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I
Hispanic	5	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	ı
American Indian/Alaskan	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	I/S	I
Disability Status									
Not Disabled	457	93.4	18.8	34.5	31.2	15.5	55.6	N/A	N
Disabled	44	75.0	75.8	18.2	6.1	N/A	6.1	I/S	N
Migrant Status		,	,			,	,	,	
Migrant	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N
Non-Migrant	501	91.8	22.9	33.3	29.4	14.4	52.1	N/A	N
English Proficiency									
imited English Proficient	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	
Non-Limited English Proficient	497	92.0	22.6	33.6	29.4	14.5	52.2	N/A	N
Socio-Economic Status	0.10	07.0	0.1.1	00.0	00.0		04.0	\/F0	
Subsidized meals	242	87.6	34.4	39.6	22.6	3.3	34.9	YES	N
Full-pay meals	259	95.8	13.0	27.9	35.2	23.9	66.8	N/A	N
	Mathemati								
All Students	501	90.0	26.4	34.9	26.2	12.4	49.1	YES	N
Gender									
Male	232	87.1	28.4	35.8	23.4	12.4	45.3	N/A	N
emale	269	92.6	24.9	34.1	28.5	12.4	52.2	N/A	N
Racial/Ethnic Group	050	00.0	40.0	04.0	05.0	00.0	00.7	V/E0	
White	250	92.8	12.6	31.2	35.9	20.3	66.7	YES	N
African-American Asian/Pacific Islander	244	87.3 I/S	41.8 I/S	38.5 I/S	15.5 I/S	4.2 I/S	30.0 I/S	YES I/S	١
Asian/Pacific Islander Hispanic	5	1/S 1/S	1/S 1/S	1/S 1/S	1/S 1/S	1/S 1/S	1/S 1/S	1/S 1/S	ľ
nispanic American Indian/Alaskan	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1/S 1/S	
Disability Status	0	IN/A	IN/A	IV/A	IN/A	IN/A	IN/A	1/3	
Not Disabled	457	91.7	23.0	36.1	27.5	13.4	51.7	N/A	N
Disabled	44	72.7	71.9	18.8	9.4	N/A	15.6	I/S	N
Migrant Status	1 17		7 1.5	10.0	0.1	14//	10.0	.,,5	, i
Migrant	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N
Non-Migrant	501	90.0	26.4	34.9	26.2	12.4	49.1	N/A	N
English Proficiency									
imited English Proficient	4	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	I/S	ı
Non-Limited English Proficient	497	90.1	26.4	34.9	26.2	12.5	49.0	N/A	N
Socio-Economic Status									
Subsidized meals	242	84.7	42.4	36.1	18.5	2.9	33.2	YES	N
Full-pay meals	259	95.0	13.1	33.9	32.7	20.4	62.4	N/A	N

Abbreviations for Missing Data

N/A Not Applicable N/AV Not Available N/C Not Collected N/R Not Reported I/S Insufficient Sample

DEFINITION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS

As required by the United States Department of Education, adequate yearly progress specifies that the statewide target is met for All Students and for the following subgroups: Racial/Ethnic, Subsidized Meals, Disability, and Limited English Proficiency.

Retention rate	Lancaster High				2901008	
New York Students (n= 1,890) Students (n= 1,890) Retention rate 12.5% Up from 0.1% 10.1% 9.1% Attendance rate 99.5% Up from 95.7% 95.7% 96.0% Eligible for grifted and talented 0.0% No change 4.9% 5.8% With disabilities other than speech 12.1% Up from 11.0% 13.2% 12.7% 10.2% 2.5% Up from 2.3% 1.6% 1.6% 2.5% Up from 2.3% 1.6% 1.6% 2.5% Up from 2.3% 1.6% 1.6% 2.2% 2.2% 2.2% Up from 95.7% 96.0% 1.6% 2.5% Up from 10.1% 10.2% 9.8% 2.2% 2.2% 2.2% Up from 10.1% 10.2% 9.8% 2.2% 2	SCHOOL PROFILE					
Retention rate			Change from Last Year	with Students	High	
Attendance rate	Students (n= 1,890)					
Eligible for gifted and talented 0.0% No change 4.9% 5.8% With disabilities other than speech 12.1% Up from 11.0% 13.2% 12.7% 12.7% Older than usual for grade 9.2% Down from 10.1% 10.2% 9.8% Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent &/or criminal offenses 2.5% Up from 2.3% 1.6%	Retention rate	12.5%	Up from 0.1%	10.1%	9.1%	
With disabilities other than speech 12.1% Up from 11.0% 13.2% 12.7% Older than usual for grade 9.2% Down from 10.1% 10.2% 9.8% Out-of-School suspensions or expulsions for violent &/or criminal offenses 2.5% Up from 2.3% 1.6% 1.6% Frorloled in AP/IB programs 7.3% Down from 9.5% 9.4% 10.2% Successful on AP/IB exams 52.6% Amoual dropout rate 5.3% Down from 7.1% 3.2% 2.7% Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations 1.2% Up from 0.0% 5.2% 3.6% Enrollment in career/technology center courses 50 Down from 82 407 466 Coresults participating in worked-based experiences 21.6% Down from 30.1% 20.4% 25.7% Career/technology students mastering core competencies Town from 75.3% 75.8% 77.7% Career/technology completers placed Paches (in-93) N/A N/A 98.7% 99.3% Teachers with advanced degrees 50.5% Up from 47.8% 49.4% 52.0% Continuing contract teachers**<	Attendance rate	99.5%	Up from 95.7%	95.7%	96.0%	
Older than usual for grade 9.2% Down from 10.1% 10.2% 9.8% Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent &/or criminal offenses 2.5% Up from 2.3% 1.6% 1.6% Enrolled in AP/IB programs 7.3% Down from 9.5% 9.4% 10.2% Successful on AP/IB exams 52.6% 43.5% 53.8% Annual dropout rate 5.3% Down from 7.1% 3.2% 2.7% Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations 1.2% Up from 0.0% 5.2% 3.6% Enrollment in career/technology center courses 50 Down from 82 407 466 Students participating in worked-based experiences 21.6% Down from 30.1% 20.4% 25.7% Career/technology students mastering core competencies 75.5% Up from 75.3% 75.8% 77.7% Career/technology completers placed N/A N/A 98.7% 99.3% Teachers with advanced degrees 50.5% Up from 47.8% 49.4% 52.0% Continuing contract teachers** 77.4% Down from 82.6% 80.0% 82.1% </td <td>Eligible for gifted and talented</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>5.8%</td>	Eligible for gifted and talented				5.8%	
Out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for violent &/or criminal offenses 2.5% Up from 2.3% 1.6% 1.6% Enrolled in AP/IB programs 7.3% Down from 9.5% 9.4% 10.2% Successful on AP/IB exams 52.6% 43.5% 53.8% Annual dropout rate 5.3% Down from 7.1% 3.2% 2.7% Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations 1.2% Up from 0.0% 5.2% 3.6% Enrollment in career/technology center courses 50 Down from 82 407 466 Courses Students participating in worked-based experiences 21.6% Down from 30.1% 20.4% 25.7% Career/technology students mastering core competencies 75.5% Up from 75.3% 75.8% 77.7% Career/technology completers placed N/A N/A 98.7% 99.3% Teachers with advanced degrees 50.5% Up from 47.8% 49.4% 52.0% Continuing contract teachers 77.4% Down from 82.6% 80.0% 82.1% Highly qualified teachers** 85.7% N/A 90.7%	With disabilities other than speech	12.1%	•	13.2%	12.7%	
expulsions for violent &/or criminal offenses 7.3% professes Down from 9.5% 9.4% professes 10.2% professes Funciled in AP/IB programs 7.3% professes Down from 9.5% professes 9.4% professes 10.2% professes 53.8% professes 43.5% professes 53.8% professes 53.8% professes 2.7% professes 2.2% professes 2.2% professes 2.2% professes 2.2% professes 2.2% professes 2.2% professes 2.2.4% professes 2.5.7% professes 2.2.4% professes						
Successful on AP/IB exams 52.6% 43.5% 53.8%	expulsions for violent &/or criminal	2.5%	Up from 2.3%	1.6%	1.6%	
Annual dropout rate	Enrolled in AP/IB programs	7.3%	Down from 9.5%	9.4%	10.2%	
Career/technology students in co-curricular organizations 1.2% Up from 0.0% 5.2% 3.6% co-curricular organizations Enrollment in career/technology center courses 50 Down from 82 407 466 Students participating in worked-based experiences 21.6% Down from 30.1% 20.4% 25.7% Career/technology students mastering core competencies 75.5% Up from 75.3% 75.8% 77.7% Career/technology completers placed Career/technology completers placed N/A N/A 98.7% 99.3% Teachers (n= 93) Teachers with advanced degrees 50.5% Up from 47.8% 49.4% 52.0% Continuing contract teachers 77.4% Down from 82.6% 80.0% 82.1% Highly qualified teachers** 85.7% N/A 90.7% 89.5% Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates 88.8% 8.6% 86.2% Teachers returning from previous year provisional certificates 95.8% Up from 88.2% 84.8% 86.2% Teacher attendance rate 95.8% Up from 94.9% 94.8% 95.3% Average teacher salary	Successful on AP/IB exams	52.6%		43.5%	53.8%	
Co-curricular organizations	Annual dropout rate	5.3%		3.2%	2.7%	
courses Students participating in worked-based experiences 21.6% Down from 30.1% 20.4% 25.7% Career/fechnology students mastering core competencies 75.5% Up from 75.3% 75.8% 77.7% Career/fechnology completers placed N/A N/A 98.7% 99.3% Teachers (n= 93) Teachers with advanced degrees 50.5% Up from 47.8% 49.4% 52.0% Continuing contract teachers 77.4% Down from 82.6% 80.0% 82.1% Highly qualified teachers** 85.7% N/A 90.7% 89.5% Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates 77.5% 8.8% 8.6% Teachers returning from previous year 90.4% Up from 88.2% 84.8% 86.2% Teachers returning from previous year 90.4% Up from 94.9% 94.8% 95.3% Average teacher salary \$39,788 Up 0.2% \$40,459 \$41,060 Prior, development days/teacher 10.2 days Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1		1.2%	Up from 0.0%	5.2%	3.6%	
Career/technology students mastering core competencies 75.5% Up from 75.3% 75.8% 77.7% Career/technology completers placed N/A N/A 98.7% 99.3% Teachers (n=93) Teachers with advanced degrees 50.5% Up from 47.8% 49.4% 52.0% Continuing contract teachers 77.4% Down from 82.6% 80.0% 82.1% Highly qualified teachers** 85.7% N/A 90.7% 89.5% Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates 77.5% 8.8% 86.6% Teachers returning from previous year Peacher attendance rate 95.8% Up from 88.2% 84.8% 86.2% Teacher attendance rate 95.8% Up from 94.9% 94.8% 95.3% Average teacher salary \$39.788 Up 0.2% \$40,459 \$41,060 Prof. development days/teacher 10.2 days Up from 10.0 days 9.9 days 10.6 days School Principal's years at school 8.0 Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 <	courses	50	Down from 82	407	466	
core competencies Career/technology completers placed N/A N/A 98.7% 99.3% Teachers (n= 93) Teachers with advanced degrees 50.5% Up from 47.8% 49.4% 52.0% Continuing contract teachers 77.4% Down from 82.6% 80.0% 82.1% Highly qualified teachers** 85.7% N/A 90.7% 89.5% Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates 7.5% N/A 90.7% 89.5% Teachers returning from previous year provisional certificates 90.4% Up from 88.2% 84.8% 86.2% Teachers returning from previous year provisional certificates 95.8% Up from 94.9% 94.8% 95.3% Average teacher salary provisional certificates \$339,788 Up 0.2% \$40,459 \$41,060 Prof. development days/teacher 10.2 days Up from 10.0 days 9.9 days 10.6 days School Principal's years at school 8.0 Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1	worked-based experiences	21.6%	Down from 30.1%	20.4%	25.7%	
Teachers (n= 93)	core competencies		•		77.7%	
Teachers with advanced degrees Continuing contract teachers 77.4% Down from 82.6% 80.0% 82.1% Highly qualified teachers** 85.7% N/A 90.7% 89.5% Teachers with emergency or 7.5% 8.8% 8.6% provisional certificates Teachers returning from previous year 90.4% Up from 88.2% 84.8% 86.2% Teacher attendance rate 95.8% Up from 94.9% 94.8% 95.3% Average teacher salary \$39,788 Up 0.2% \$40,459 \$41,060 Prof. development days/teacher 10.2 days Up from 10.0 days 9.9 days 10.6 days School Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1 26.4 to 1 Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Down from 63.1% 58.0% 57.9% salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program *Prior year audited financial data are reported. Our District State Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1% Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes Met State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes	Career/technology completers placed	N/A	N/A	98.7%	99.3%	
Continuing contract teachers 77.4% Down from 82.6% 80.0% 82.1% Highly qualified teachers** 85.7% N/A 90.7% 89.5% Teachers with emergency or 7.5% 8.8% 8.6% provisional certificates Teachers returning from previous year 90.4% Up from 88.2% 84.8% 86.2% Teacher attendance rate 95.8% Up from 94.9% 94.8% 95.3% Average teacher salary \$39,788 Up 0.2% \$40,459 \$41,060 Prof. development days/teacher 10.2 days Up from 10.0 days 9.9 days 10.6 days School Principal's years at school 8.0 Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1 26.4 to 1 Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 Down 5.3% \$6,272 \$6,310 Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent No change Excellent Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program *Prior year audited financial data are reported. Our District State Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1% State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes	Teachers (n= 93)					
Highly qualified teachers** 85.7% N/A 90.7% 89.5% Teachers with emergency or 7.5% 8.8% 8.6% provisional certificates Teachers with emergency or 7.5% 8.8% 8.6% 8.6% provisional certificates Teachers returning from previous year 90.4% Up from 88.2% 84.8% 86.2% 7.2% 99.4% 94.8% 95.3	Teachers with advanced degrees					
Teachers with emergency or provisional certificates 7.5% 8.8% 8.6% provisional certificates Teachers returning from previous year Teacher attendance rate 90.4% Up from 88.2% 84.8% 86.2% Teacher attendance rate 95.8% Up from 94.9% 94.8% 95.3% Average teacher salary \$39,788 Up 0.2% \$40,459 \$41,060 Prof. development days/teacher 10.2 days Up from 10.0 days 9.9 days 10.6 days School School 8.0 Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1 26.4 to 1 Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 Down from 63.1% 58.0% 57.9% Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* 63.0% Down from 63.1% 58.0% 57.9% Opportunities in the arts Excellent No change Excellent Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9%	· ·					
Teachers returning from previous year 79.4% Up from 88.2% 84.8% 86.2% Teacher attendance rate 95.8% Up from 94.9% 94.8% 95.3% Average teacher salary \$39,788 Up 0.2% \$40,459 \$41,060 Prof. development days/teacher 10.2 days Up from 10.0 days 9.9 days 10.6 days School Principal's years at school 8.0 Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1 26.4 to 1 Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 Down 5.3% \$6,272 \$6,310 Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent No change Excellent Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program Average N/A Good Good *Prior year audited financial data are reported. Our District State Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1% Met State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes			N/A			
Teacher attendance rate 95.8% Up from 94.9% 94.8% 95.3% Average teacher salary \$39,788 Up 0.2% \$40,459 \$41,060 Prof. development days/teacher 10.2 days Up from 10.0 days 9.9 days 10.6 days School 8.0 Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1 26.4 to 1 Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 Down 5.3% \$6,272 \$6,310 Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* 63.0% Down from 63.1% 58.0% 57.9% Salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent No change Excellent Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program *Prior year audited financial data are reported. Our District	provisional certificates					
Prof. development days/teacher 10.2 days Up from 10.0 days 9.9 days 10.6 days School Principal's years at school 8.0 Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1 26.4 to 1 Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 Down 5.3% \$6,272 \$6,310 Percent of expenditures for teacher 63.0% Down from 63.1% 58.0% 57.9% salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent No change Excellent Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program Average N/A Good Good *Prior year audited financial data are reported. Our District State Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1% Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes	Teachers returning from previous year Teacher attendance rate					
School Principal's years at school 8.0 Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1 26.4 to 1 Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 Down 5.3% \$6,272 \$6,310 Percent of expenditures for teacher 63.0% Down from 63.1% 58.0% 57.9% salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent No change Excellent Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program *Prior year audited financial data are reported. Average N/A Good Good **Prior year audited financial data are reported. **Our District **State* Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 92.7% 92.0% Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1%	Average teacher salary	\$39,788		\$40,459	\$41,060	
Principal's years at school 8.0 Up from 7.0 4.0 3.0 Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1 26.4 to 1 Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 Down 5.3% \$6,272 \$6,310 Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* 63.0% Down from 63.1% 58.0% 57.9% Sport unities in the arts Excellent No change Excellent Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program *Prior year audited financial data are reported. N/A Good Good Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 92.7% 92.0% Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1% State Objective Met State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes	Prof. development days/teacher	10.2 days	Up from 10.0 days	9.9 days	10.6 days	
Student-teacher ratio in core subjects 28.8 to 1 Down from 31.4 to 1 26.8 to 1 26.4 to 1 Prime instructional time 94.1% Up from 89.3% 89.2% 90.0% Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 Down 5.3% \$6,272 \$6,310 Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent No change Excellent Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program Average N/A Good Good *Prior year audited financial data are reported. Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 90.9% State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes	School					
Prime instructional time 94.1% by from 89.3% 89.2% began 100% 90.0% Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 by 4,446 bown 5.3% \$6,272 began 200% \$6,310 Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* 63.0% bown from 63.1% bown from 63.1% 58.0% began 200% 57.9% Opportunities in the arts Excellent No change Excellent Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% by from 78.9% by 90.9% by	Principal's years at school			4.0		
Dollars spent per pupil* \$4,446 Down 5.3% \$6,272 \$6,310 Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program Average N/A Good Good *Prior year audited financial data are reported. **Dur District** **Our District** **Our District** **Our District** **State** Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** **June 1.1% Beta 1.1% Beta 2.1% Beta	Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	28.8 to 1	Down from 31.4 to 1	26.8 to 1	26.4 to 1	
Percent of expenditures for teacher salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program Average N/A Good Good *Prior year audited financial data are reported. **Pighly qualified teachers in low poverty schools*** **Dur District* **Our District* **Our District* **State* **Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools** **90.9% 91.1% **State* **Met State* **Met St	Prime instructional time					
salaries* Opportunities in the arts Excellent Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program *Prior year audited financial data are reported. Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** Pighly qualified teachers in high poverty schools** State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** State Objective						
Parents attending conferences 80.7% Up from 78.9% 90.9% 89.3% SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program Average N/A Good Good *Prior year audited financial data are reported. **Dur District State** Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 92.7% 92.0% Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1% State Objective Met State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes	salaries*					
SACS accreditation Yes No change Yes Yes Character development program Average N/A Good Good *Prior year audited financial data are reported. **Our District State** Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 92.7% 92.0% Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1% State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes			~			
* Prior year audited financial data are reported. * Dur District State Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** 92.7% 92.0% Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1% * State Objective Met State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes	Parents attending conferences SACS accreditation					
Highly qualified teachers in low poverty schools** Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools** 92.7% 92.0% 91.1% State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Met State Objective Yes	Character development program * Prior year audited financial data are reported.	Average		Good	Good	
Highly qualified teachers in high poverty schools** 90.9% 91.1% State Objective Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Met State Objective Yes			Sta	ate		
Highly qualified teachers in this school** State Objective Met State Objective 45.0% Yes			92.7%	92.	0%	
Highly qualified teachers in this school** 65.0% Yes	Highly qualified teachers in high povert	y schools**				
* * *		State Objective	Met State	Objective		
Student attendance in this school 95.3% Yes		*	65.0%	Yes		
	Student attendance in this school		95.3%	Y	es	

^{**}NOTE: The verification process was not completed for the year reported; therefore the count of highly qualified teachers may not be accurate.

REPORT OF PRINCIPAL AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT COUNCIL

The mission of Lancaster High School is to assist students in becoming successful, well-adjusted, contributing members of society by providing an atmosphere which encourages academic, vocational, and personal growth through a challenging curriculum in partnership with home and community. The 2003-2004 year began a year of transition for Lancaster High School. The school, along with the district, participated in a High School Redesign Study which focused on many aspects of secondary education in Lancaster County. The recommendations from this study should provide better learning opportunities for all of our students. Our school continued studying the middle years' International Baccalaureate Program to support students participating in this program at the middle school level. In addition, we began the initial stage of The High Schools That Work program which prepares students for both post-secondary education and careers. Also, the high school and the vocational school will be combined July 1 into a comprehensive high school. The school produced its largest graduating class since arriving in our present building eleven years ago. These seniors distinguished themselves with numerous scholarship awards. Recognizing the dropout rate as one of our most serious obstacles, the school experienced a 2.3% decline in dropouts, and this rate should be even lower for this year.

During the school year, two more of our teachers became National Board Certified. While many of our teachers pursued individual needs and interests in professional development, all of our departments received training in data analysis, writing across the curriculum, the International Baccalaureate program, and working with students of poverty. Our ROTC program, yearbook and Junior Civitans continue to be recognized for distinction on the state and national level.

LHS must continue to focus on helping students remain in school, developing social and personal responsibility among students, improving school-home relations, placing more emphasis on writing, reading, and critical thinking, and continuing our growth in math achievement. We invite everyone to be an integral part of LHS. There is so much to be done with our students. They need our support, time and resources.

Joseph C. Keenan, Principal Lavilla Brevard, SIC Chairperson

EVALUATIONS BY TEACHERS, STUDENTS, AND PARENTS						
	Teachers	Students*	Parents*			
Number of surveys returned	79	284	77			
Percent satisfied with learning environment	60.3%	69.0%	80.0%			
Percent satisfied with social and physical environment	55.8%	70.8%	76.6%			
Percent satisfied with home-school relations	29.5%	81.7%	73.0%			
*Only eleventh grade students and their parents were included. For schools without	out grade 11, only	the highest grade	was included.			